

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

|                                |   |                                  |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| <b>MARY R. BOWER, et al.,</b>  | ) |                                  |
|                                | ) |                                  |
| <b>Plaintiffs.</b>             | ) |                                  |
|                                | ) |                                  |
| <b>v.</b>                      | ) | <b>Case No. 05-3221-CV-S-GAF</b> |
|                                | ) |                                  |
| <b>SPRINGFIELD R-12 SCHOOL</b> | ) |                                  |
| <b>DISTRICT, et al.,</b>       | ) |                                  |
|                                | ) |                                  |
| <b>Defendants.</b>             | ) |                                  |

**ORDER**

Presently before the Court is “Plaintiff Mary Bower’s Objections to Defendant Jane Hancock’s Answers to First Set of Interrogatories and Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel.” (Doc. #74). The Defendants have not filed a response to this filing. In her filing, Plaintiff Mary Bower (“Bower”) appears to be challenging the Defendants’ relevancy objections to the interrogatories Bower served upon Defendant Jane Hancock (“Defendant Hancock”).<sup>1</sup> Bower asserts that these interrogatories are relevant and that she has evidence to rebut what she believes Defendant Hancock’s answers should be. Although the filing is identified as a “Motion to Compel,” Bower fails to request any specific relief from the Court. As no relief has been requested, this filing is MOOT.

---

<sup>1</sup>In the filing, Bower states her objection as follows: “Apparently, the interrogatories were answered by the Attorney for Plaintiff who was not present when the specifics occurred. The interrogatories are answered in second person format.” (Doc. #74). Bower’s purported objection is incomprehensible as she is the Plaintiff, she served the interrogatories on Hancock and she is not represented by an attorney. Furthermore, second person format was not employed by the person responding to Bower’s interrogatories as second person pronouns are absent in the cited responses.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Gary A. Fenner  
GARY A. FENNER, JUDGE  
United States District Court

DATED: March 14, 2006